Not Building the International Today

A response to the USFI Majority Resolution by Roy Rollin for the supporters of the International Trotskyist Opposition in the FIC

The majority resolution, adopted by the February 1993 USec, "Building the International Today," would be more to the point if it were prefaced with the word *not*. There are, of course, a number of ritualistic references "toward(s) building this international and its sections," so as to reassure some of the more wary majority supporters. Thus, Steve Bloom can state that "it combines an understanding of the fundamental importance of programmatic continuity with a genuine non-sectarianism and openness to other currents" and continue in his sleepwalking. But those with their eyes open will draw other conclusions. Especially, if they base them upon what's been said, and, more importantly, done when it comes to what Bloom describes as "the concrete practice of regroupment and fusion carried out by some sections in recent years.

To begin with, we might ask just which individuals, groups or organizations constitute these "other currents." For nowhere in the resolution, the majority report to the May meeting of the IEC or in the "Summary of Comments Made by Steve" himself is this question answered. Indeed no specifics are ever cited when it comes to perspective partners. Nevertheless, the document's main thrust is to continue the liquidationist line which the 12th World Congress inaugurated in 1985 and which has wrecked havoc in our ranks since. The balance sheet of this process can only be negative; it has led to the disappearance of a number of sections (Germany, Peru, Columbia, Spain and now Switzerland), the dispersal of our forces, and no gains for the International or revolutionary Marxism. Even Bloom has to admit that "some of these did move in the direction of programmatic dissolution in order to make the fusion work." As to which of "these" moved in the opposite direction, Bloom remains silent. That silence speaks quite loudly in this case.

From Adaptation to Liquidation

If the whole shop hasn't yet been given away at bargain basement prices, it's not due to the leadership's not trying. There just aren't many interested buyers out there in the so-called "world revolutionary movement" in need of a "minor tributary" to sail down. Far from being a serious attempt to address "the general crisis of the workers movement and the socialist project," let alone "a credible political strategy that coincides with the concrete relationship of forces," the document is but the latest in a long line of get-rich-quick schemes which a worn-out and washed-up leadership hopes will enable the USFI to break out of the bushes and make it to the big leagues. Liquidationism is but the logical consequence of a whole history of attempts at trying to build the International by adapting to those currents which appeared to be in "motion," be it the Stalinists in the early 50s, the Castroists in the 60s, radicalizing student youth in the early 70s, and most recently the Sandinistas and the Brazilian PT. It reflects the demoralization felt by many of the enrages of '68 in the face of the "end of history" and the "collapse of communism." Only what's really collapsed are all the bum steers they've hedged their bets on over the years. When Trotsky wrote that "for the (Stalinist Comintern...tactics consist of periodic zigzags and strategy is the arithmetic sum of the zigzags," he could of, for all intents and purposes, been describing the USFI.

In the not-so-distant past when revolution was still seen as being around the corner, the Sandinistas were the ticket. Now that that train has been canceled, the PT in Brazil is where the action is. Perhaps a quick fix from Lula will make up for the lack of any more from Daniel Ortega. So at the May meeting of the IEC, not a few comrades expressed indignation when Ernest Mandel dared to suggest that it was impossible for the PT as a whole to become a revolutionary party with a clear-cut anti-capitalist program. Mandel went on to point out that in light of all of Lula's breaking bread with the bourgeoisie, a PT government might constitute an obstacle to any advances on the part of the masses and posed dangers of the Chilean type if there was any vacillation on our part towards its character and program. To many a majority supporter, however, "the main problem...is to win the elections with mass social participation, and without Lula that is impossible." So Mandel's call for the Brazilian comrades to fight for the adoption of an anti-capitalist action program and to be prepared to break with Lula, if need be, fell on many a deaf ear.

The New Line: For Two, Three Many Liquidations

Of course, the actual "components" of the mysterious "world revolutionary movement" that the USFI leadership waxes over endlessly are a lot less palatable than the Brazilian PT. The latter at least has the merits of being a mass working class party, however serious its programmatic problems may be. As far as "our partners" over at the Sao Paulo Forum go, it's almost taken for granted that the negative international situation means that the best one can come with up these days is a "post-liberal state." They won't get many arguments from Latin American majority supporters. Both wings of the split section in Mexico have already jumped on board the Cardenas bandwagon. And it wasn't too long ago that Peruvian USFI supporters, having dissolved themselves into the PUM, called for a vote for the neo-liberal, Fujimori, as a lesser evil to the reactionary Vargas Llosa. Perhaps this is what the 13th Congress' "Resolution on Latin America" meant by not "neglect(ing) the struggle for democracy and the defense of the oppressed nation" and the importance of "forming political fronts."

Reading out the riot act, the Latin American Bureau reporter made sure to remind comrades that they should be under no illusions about building organizations based on the FI's program. The later, it is claimed, remains a useful "reference point." Judging from the actual regroup

nents that have taken place in Spain and Germany and he potential partners the French LCR has courted over the years, one could ask, useful for what? We are supposed to be in a new period in which, according to Bloom, "some of the old programmatic divisions between us and others on the left begin to break down" (which ones he doesn't say). So this "reference point" becomes little more than a dime-store dowry to be handed over to yesterday's centrists, who have magically been transformed by today's events into "revolutionary Marxist organizations." And so far all of them have demanded as a prenuptial now that we abandon that "reference point" before the knot is tied.

Far from being any part of the "recomposition" of today's workers movement, these regroupments are but episodes in the decomposition of yesterday's radical milieu. Least of all do they constitute any kind of "firm assessment of the objective reality of the world and of our current." The reality is more a false theory of party building than of unfavorable objective circumstances. The liquidation of the GIM, the German section, with the ex-Maoist KPD to form the VSP, in fact, took place in early 1985. That is, quite some time before the "new world balance of power" began to take shape. In other words, it was a conscious political act, supported by the USec and the IEC as it translated the 12th Congress' turn into practice. The holes in the "Unification Platform of the German Revolutionaries" on orientation towards trade unions, the nature of the SPD and the Greens and tactics towards them and proletarian revolution itself (referred to as "political revolution" by the Platform) made the fused organization as worthless a vehicle for intervention in the German class struggle as an umbrella having similar such holes would be the minute the first raindrops began to fall. A group of German comrades thus concluded that,

> The leadership of the FI is co-responsible for the situation in every respect. During the (fusion) negotiations it took no political position. It didn't define the criteria on which to judge an eventual success or failure of the fusion project. Afterwards it separated itself almost totally from the VSP and *Inprekorr*. The disastrous consequences of this attitude became clear when the eventsin the GDR and (all of) Germany started gaining momentum.

In spite of the fact that German FI supporters are now divided into three groups, the resolution cites Germany as "a countr(y)...where our section can gain credit and influence among the vanguard and in the mass movement." Perhaps the more sections there are, the more "credit and influence" there is to be gained! What was a tragedy in Germany become a farce in Spain. While it is true that some in the USec may have argued for the Spanish comrades forming a tendency in the MC, today they all engage in apologetics for the politics that led to the liquidation of the Spanish LCR since the essence of the draft resolution is for two, three, many liquidations. "That is (the) one reason why a concrete discussion of specific balance sheets" that Steve Bloom is patiently waiting for will be a long time in coming. Of course, when it comes to "some of these (fusions)...mov(ing) in the direction of programmatic dissolution in order to make the fusion work," Bloom doesn't have to look halfway around the world. He can take a peek into his own backyard in Detroit, where such questions as supporting yuppie Democrats like Bill Clinton and imperialist intervention in the Balkans have become subjects for debate.

The French LCR: From Che to Chevenement

As far as the French LCR is concerned, "trying to make the League a center of convergence today" means that "there is no other choice than to aim to build a new force drawing together all those who sincerely want to fight for the transformation of society without necessarily having to agree on reform or revolution." Since "there has been a change of epoch," "the big question, is, how should we rewrite our program" as the creation of a "non-strategically delimited party" is now on the order of the day. And just "who sincerely want(s) to fight for the transformation of society" according to the LCR majority? A whole host of Mitterand's former ministers from both the PCF and the SP, all of whom are astute enough to smell the stench coming from the corpse of French reformism after 12 years of its administering capitalism for the capitalists and all of whom remain just as committed to doing more of the same provided they can get another chance.

Of course today's *Refondateurs*, like yesterday's *Renovateurs*, are but the latest in a long list of "forces" which have been the object of the LCR's amorous attentions ever since they missed their big chance back in May '68. Towards those ends, the LCR signed an "agreement for change on the left," an electoral platform signed by all the culls and retreads of the demoralized left that in no way, shape or form challenged the political and economic power of the French bourgeoisie or even the politics of Mitterand's sinking Socialist Party. As if to show just how politically "convergent" the LCR has become with its new playmates, it reproached Mitterand for his "inaction" in ex-Yugoslavia while Alain Krivine officially signed a petition calling for "EC intervention in Bosnia." Perhaps, this is what Steve Bloom had in mind when he writes that "it is in this sense that some of the old programmatic divisions between us and others on the left begin to break down."

The USFI Personals: Trotskyists Need Not Apply

For all of its rolling out of the red carpet for "an array of forces who might want to identify with a revolutionary socialist outlook," the majority certainly doesn't have to worry about it getting too worn-out in the process. Outside of a few liquidators, past and present (Michel Pablo's AMRI and Jim Percy's DSP in Australia), looking for a place to hang their hats, few of the leadership's projected partners seem to "want to identify with a revolutionary socialist outlook." So far it has been USFI supporters who have wound up identifying with outlooks that were anything but revolutionary socialist.

At the same time a sectarian arrogance is displayed towards any and every other Trotskyist current. This, in spite of the fact that some of these organizations equal (Brazil, France, United States) or outnumber (Argentina, Great Britain, Greece) USFI supporters in many parts of the world In some cases they have even been growing (the British SWP and Labor Militant) or at least holding their own in spite of the unfavorable objective circumstances that are alleged to have caused our forces to decline and dwindle. Not only do these militants consti-

ute the vast majority of "really existing" revolutionists on he planet today; they at least still defend class struggle politics whatever their other shortcomings. may be. That is certainly much more than can be said of the shadowy "world revolutionary movement" the leadership chooses o focus so much attention on.

Not surprisingly, the only success the USFI has, in fact, had in the realm of regroupments has been with the NSSP n Sri Lanka. The latter is, of all things, a Trotskyist organization! Far from moving in any kind of leftward direction, he vast majority of "currents, groups or factions of Maoist, Castroist or even neo-Stalinist origin" are moving n just the opposite direction. This is just as much a symptom of their chronic political and programmatic weaknesses as it is a reflection of the working class being on the defensive worldwide. That the majority "can now envisage more easily winning them to our project" is symptomatic of their rightward trajectory as well.

Cutting Off Our Arms to Save Our...

All of the much ballyhooed humility and "rejection of pretension" that the majority document reeks of, along with he claims of its supporters to be "enriching our tradition 'and) bringing in something new from the new reality" are out attempts to entice regroupment partners with a clear conscious. What's being brought in are more abandonments of our basic programmatic premises and that's hardly new. Afterall, on the road to Managua, an ample amount of Trotskyist baggage was unloaded to make the rip easier. And even though the 13th World Congress ook place after the verdict was in on the erroneous positions on the permanent revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the necessity for the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and planning ("the mixed economy") as far as Nicaragua was concerned, the resolutions produced by the Congress continued to uphold them as good coin. Ditto those on regroupment, where a fundamentally positive balance sheet of the process was drawn.

At least the Sandinistas held state power. Now to make oom for a few more exhausted and demoralized children of the sixties still more must be thrown overboard. Since ew of the "broad vanguard forces" are "mov(ing) closer o our positions," our positions will have to move closer to hem! Or, as a Swedish comrade at the May IEC meeting out it, we will have to "cut off our arms" in the process of embracing such partners. So the need for a revolutionary nternational composed of revolutionary parties based on a revolutionary program is now up for grabs. That is the 'mutation" the majority is clamoring for. If "to no longer be simply perceived as one 'Trotskyist' grouping among others" is their main concern, they need not worry. The continuation of the present course should insure that none perceives the USFI as any kind of Trotskyist grouping at all! Indeed, this evolution from adaptation to liquidation is well understood and appreciated by FIC leaders Bloom and Misnik as it provides official confirmation for their "non-sectarian and open" project and a rejection of what he former characterizes as "the old 'define the program correctly and the masses will come to you eventually' school" of party-building.

Bloom, of course, has to look over his shoulders every now and then to make sure his former FIT friends and BIDOM buddies are not getting too antsy over the fusion fiasco he engineered with Solidarity and leaving him in the lurch as yet another general without an army at the same time he continues to bow and scrape before all the "rethinkers" of Marxism. Thus he has become a master in the art of doublespeak; which, he, no doubt defines as dialectics. So he hastens to assure all of them that while he "agree(s) with...maintaining our individual and collective belief in a particular set of programmatic ideas, the appropriate organizational solution should be based on a somewhat broader definition of...forces...expect(ing) only a clear and uncompromising commitment to revolutionary-democratic politics." In other words, we adhere to closet Leninism and Trotskyism, while "at least for the present, we can conceive of ourselves more like pre-1917 Social Democracy..." Can't get much "broader" and "democratic" than that, can you?

From Aspiring to Lead to Longing to Follow

The question that has been posed by the majority is not over how to build the international, but whether to build it all. Nobody in their right mind, probably not even Nat Weinstein or Jeff Mackler, "pretend(s) to have the monopoly on revolutionary thought and action." Nor do we harbor any illusions that, in our current state, we are the "world party of socialist revolution." Trotskyism, however, remains the only existing current in the workers movement that has at least weathered the storms of the New World Order while continuing to base itself upon a consistent Marxist worldview. Just because "we do not have the answers to everything" doesn't mean we don't have the answers to anything or, for that matter, still don't have more answers than any anyone else does. So we are not on such shaky ground when we say that we are at least the nucleus of such a world party. Such a world party will have to be built around our program, since that program remains the sole means for understanding the world, with all the "questions confronting us today," and intervening in it to change it. That is, providing we attempt to translate that program from theory into practice rather than "redefining" it to death. The line of the majority has been and continues to be to see that the former never takes place as it would alienate future fusion partners as being "dogmatic" and "sectarian."

If they're talking about Maoist movementistas or CP-stragglers seeking solace in post-modernist modes of thought they've got a case. If they're talking about "people in Eastern Europe, Brazil, revolutionary currents in Africa and Asia ," as majority spokespersons claim to be, that's another story. What "healthy militant vanguard forces" are going to be attracted to a current that describes itself as nothing more than a "minor tributary" of some ill-defined "world revolutionary movement" and thus has no real reason for seeing any "centrality" to its existence. If the USFI has missed the boat in these and other countries, as the majority laments, it's not for our having "present(ed) ourselves...merely in old Trotskyist jargon," but for not having presented ourselves at all.

Under the guise of holding an "anti-sectarian attitude," USFI supporters have been too busy burying themselves in "mass movements" as "best builders" for an assortment of reformist bureaucracies and have consistently refused

attraction...for all the healthy militant vanguard forces." In the German VSP, not only was the sending of cadre to the ex-GDR *verbotten*, but Flers who desired to build a section in East Germany were threatened with expulsion! Sort of made Mandel's talk at the time of building a "politically capable vanguard" to "open the way for the victory and consolidation of the political revolution" just that, talk. In the ex-USSR, even talk about "politically capable vanguard(s)" was too expensive. (Must have been all the inflation the market reforms brought with them!) The "left-wings" of *glasnost* and *perestroika*, Boris Kagarlitsky's Socialist Party and Alexander Buzgalin's "Marxist Platform" in the CPSU, became the latest in a long line of "blunted instruments" whose tip was too dull to make but the slightest incision on the body politic of the Soviet proletariat. Now, as workers in the former eastern bloc begin to look for an alternative to the shock therapy being administered by the restorationist sections of the bureaucracy at the behest of the IMF, they can see none other than that offered by the ex-Stalinists, since no "politically capable vanguard" was ever assembled and rooted in the vanguard layers of the East European and Soviet working classes to begin with.

Instead of being a "a pole of attraction," the USFI has become an international of inaction, incapable of any such initiatives. Multi-purpose movementism has replaced intervening in the class struggle on the basis of a specific program. Instead of aspiring to lead, we long to follow. Needless to say, the lack of any kind of democratic centralism doesn't help matters. In the name of "national specificity" sections go and come as they please. Instead the USFI has become little more than an international messenger service, whose "network of militants" can keep the various "components" of the "world revolutionary movement" up on each other's doings while they leave us the bill.

What's New: The Garbage or the Can?

When all is said and done, what legitimizes our existence as a current separate and apart from all others in the workers movement is our program; our "political passport" as Trotsky put it. History has come to know this program as Trotskyism. Yes, aspects of it need to be "update(d) and renew(ed)" in the face of an everchanging world reality. On this, we are all in agreement. But in the hands of the majority this basic truth has become a platitude that serves as a smokescreen to legitimize their manueverings and moribund methodology. For what is involved here is not a question of "enriching" our program but of abandoning it. Since their program has long consisted of an assortment of adaptations to whatever forces appeared to be dominant in the workers movement, they can only tail after those which prevail today, despair and disillusionment.

In the late 1930s, when similar such sentiments held sway over much of the far left, Trotsky pointed out how not only was the working class and its vanguard weakened, but that its general ideological level was lowered and political thinking was thrown back to stages long since past. He went on to say that rather than defend the heritage of revolutionary thought in order to educate new cadres for the struggles to come (which they consider "sectarian") the handwringers and doomsayers instead do their best to destroy that tradition and go backward in their search for a "New Word." For all their talk that everything *old is new again*, majority supporters have yet to provide any particulars for claiming that "the framework in which the problems of the revolution and thus previous differences were posed...has deeply changed."

Endlessly invoking "new" as if it were a mantra, majority ideologues have treated us to little more than cliches, banalities and above all, solicitude for their own self-preservation. But what is really so new about this "crisis of socialisms" they claim to have discovered other than the crisis of their own collapsed illusions in one or another "broad vanguard" force?" Didn't the *Transitional Program* focus on the crisis of working class leadership, and wasn't the International founded in the first place to resolve that crisis? Or must we go back to square one and rebuild the workers movement from scratch, "redefining" our program along the way? What other conclusion can be drawn from the assertion that we have entered a "new epoch" that requires a "new party" and a "new program," not to mention a "Fifth International." What that would mean is that the capitalist system as a whole would have resolved the contradictions that characterize it in the imperialist epoch and had entered into a period of prosperity in which, in a long-range sense, the struggle for power would be replaced by the struggle for reforms. Taking revolution off the agenda means taking with it the need for parties prepared to lead it. Back to the future in fact means back to the Second International, for what else are "non-strategically defined parties," and away from the Fourth, even when it's called the Fifth!

The Insufficiency of Trotskyism... Compared to What

Having provided not a shred of Marxist analysis, the best majority spokespersons can do is to ask whether "Leninism-Trotskyism (is) sufficient to answer the questions confronting us today?" Posing the question that way, they are thus more easily able to "answer" it. Thus we are told that the "historical delimitat(ion of) the 'Trotskyist' current from the others" has been rendered less relevant than before with the collapse of Stalinism. Our whole program is reduced to "the analysis of the Stalinist Soviet Union," something that can easily be tossed aside as soon as a perspective partner crosses our path. As if Trotskyism could be limited to Soviet studies or some sectarian scullduggery out of the 1930s ("historical references to splits and complex cracks within the communist movement").

Leninism made an invaluable contribution to Marxism in its analysis of the imperialist epoch as one of wars and revolutions and pointed out the consequences that that implied for the working class, vis-a-vis the revolutionary party and the bourgeois state. Trotskyism, expanding upon the programmatic conquests that Leninism furnished, further enriched the arsenal of Marxism with the theory of permanent revolution (a useful "reference point" for developments in South Africa and Brazil, perhaps?), its critique of popular frontism (does Mexico ring a bell?), an analysis of fascism and how to fight it (a question of some importance in Europe today), the relationship between the

state and revolution and ...
geois and proletarian democracy, conveniently forgotten by a whole host of Sandalistas.

Has any other "component" of the "world revolitionary movement" added anything essential to these conclusions and generalizations? Most importantly Trotskyism has attempted to apply in practice the Leninist theory of organization since all of this can be condensed into the need to build parties to lead the struggle for power. Far from being rendered obsolete by "the turmoil in the global situation," that struggle remains on the order of the day if humanity is to survive into the next century.

Mistaking the Moment for the Epoch

Majority supporters like to claim that their assessment of the present period and the tasks that derive from it are based upon a "strategic analysis (of) the actual relationship of class and social forces at a particular historical moment." We would not dispute that that is indeed the Marxist method for attempting to understand the current "conjuncture," or any other one, for that matter. Only we fail to see the USFI majority actually applying it. Instead they veer from one empiricist and impressionist adaptation to another; the only difference between yesterday and today being that between optimism and pessimism as to the availability of "forces" to tailend after.

Unlike the Stalinophobic Cliffites or Socialist Action, we do not choose to delude ourselves that revolution is right around the corner or even down the block in order to vindicate a particular sectarian shibboleth or raison d'etre and keep our flock faithful. We would, however, agree with Lukacs that,

> Neither Marx nor Lenin ever thought of the actuality of the revolution and its aims as being readily realizable at any given moment...However, it was through this actuality that both gained a sure touchstone for evaluating all questions of the day. The actuality of the revolution provides the key-note of a whole epoch.

And that epoch remains one of structural crisis for world capitalism which, in turn, requires a revolutionary vanguard party which is capable of changing the world as well as interpreting it. The majority, on the other hand, mistakes a particular moment in capitalist development for its whole history and bases its whole outlook upon it. But how could it be otherwise. Those who were wrong yesterday can hardly be expected to be right today, let alone tomorrow when they continue to make use of the same moribund methodology that was fundamentally flawed to begin with.

For our part, we have no qualms with those who *begin* by saying that there is "a crisis of the international workers' movement." One would have to be blind to deny that. Our problem is with those who *end* there as well, throwing up their hands in dispair about "generalized downturns in mass struggles" to legitimize their liquidationism. Perhaps if they had assessed the upheavals in the USSR and Eastern Europe a bit more critically to begin with, they would not have been so disoriented by the outcome. Coming as it did with the workers in the east atomized and apathetic, "the final collapse of the Stalinist system" has aided and abetted the employers' offensive in the west. Now that there is no more "spectre of communism" dismantle the "welfare state" they built to help do so. B... while the working class may be down it is still far fr... out. The bosses' attacks on social programs, jobs an... wages have provoked a rise in working class struggl... across Europe. And while the economic crisis in both th... east and the west has brought with it a rise or racism an... fascism it has also generated a wave of youth radicaliza... tion in response to it.

The end of the Cold War has resulted not in anothe... American Century but in massive social unrest and turmoi... as the capitalist system remains mired in a chronic crisi... with no sign of international recovery. In the ex-Sovie... bloc countries capitalism is being built at a snail's pace... and the imperialists are not about to be bailed out by... absorbing them into the capitalist world market. Nowhere... have the organizations of the working class been ground... under by the jackboot of reaction the way they were in... the thirties. Nor is the bourgeoisie in any position to ride... any long booms back to prosperity the way they did in... the fifties; two other periods when a whole host of repentant radicals foreswore the Gods that had failed them and made their peace with the status quo.

There will be decisive struggles all across the board because the contradictions of the capitalist system continue to push in that direction. They can just as easilly be... aggravated, rather than alleviated, by the developments... in the east, where the imperialists may have bitten off... more than they can chew. It is out of those struggles that a... newly radicalized vanguard layer of workers, particularly... young workers, will arise. That is the human material with... which a revolutionary party and a revolutionary international can be built, for it is only in situations of struggle that genuine revolutionary regroupments can and will take place. It is in those situations that genuine leftward moving tendencies will arise, either inside or outside of the... main currents in the workers movement. If we are going to... orient towards them and intervene in them, then we must... be able to make the distinction between leftward and... rightward moving forces; between the spent forces of yesterday and the fresh ones of today and tomorrow.

Yes, we must discuss and debate with other currents;... we cannot sit still in splendid isolation. But we cannot confuse that with unprincipled unifications by deluding ourselves that "we share much of our program and heritage" with currents we don't. *First and foremost, we must build ourselves as a programatically homogenous organization so that we can win others over to our program on the basis of political agreement.* Proposals for united actions,... joint campaigns and even entryism remain means... towards those ends *providing we maintain a progamatic... and organizational cohesion and firmness* in doing so. As Ernest Mandel pointed out in *The Leninist Theory of Organization,*

> The proletaria(t)...will never reach its historic objective if the necessary education, schooling and testing of a proletarian vanguard in the working out and agititational application of the revolutionary program in struggle has not taken place before the outbreak of the broadest mass struggles, which by themselves create only the possibility of the broad masses attaining revolutionary consciousness.

only during the struggle itself this is contingent upon its already having begun to develop *before* the struggle breaks out. That means preparing for the advances of tomorrow in the retreats of today and resisting the demoralization and despair that comes along the way rather than being swept away by it. The first step in that direction is to reject the approach being pushed by the USFI majority; an approach which amounts to the exact opposite. The next is to join with those of us in the ITO who are already fighting to do so. ■

Revised 23 December 1993